

Your R.S. ticket for Edith
had unexpectedly to be in
London on the day of the
Conversations & by your ticket,
& by sleeping at a Hotel & so as
to be off the next morning at 5,
was able to attend the Conversations.

Love to Harriette. I suppose
you are just making your
arrangements to start for
Canada -

Yours affectionately
G. Augustine Stoney.

8 Upper Horsey Rise (N.)

1897, June 21.

Dear George - 13/4

I take your 'simplest
Object, w^h I understand to
be an object confined to one
plane & consisting in it of
one ruling of luminous // lines
in w^h the intensity follows the
law $(1 - \cos 2\pi \frac{x}{\ell})$, where ℓ is
a constant & x is a \perp in the
plane to the ruling. For further
simplicity let the light be of
wavelength λ .

Suppose then such a ruling
occupying one square cm of the

plane, & let no light be emitted
from any other part of the objective
field. Let the sq. cm. of the
plane have any definite shape
— square, round, or in the form
of the letter 'a' or 'd'. 13/11

Now what is true is that this
light in that plane may be
resolved into rulings all of wave-
length λ , ∞ in number, directed
towards every azimuth in the plane,
each extending over the whole
infinite plane, & each having its
phases and directions of transversal
following (throughout that whole
extent) the special recurrent law
wh. belongs to a ruling arising
from the interference upon the
plane of two undulations of ∞

plane uniform pendulous waves
pouring down upon it from some
(which may be any) two directions.

This I have proved to be
true, however disorderly may
be the distribution of the phases
of the waves & of the vectors of
the transversals over your
selected object; & whether the
object be the one you have
chosen, or such as we see when
we look at the moon, or at a tree.

Now that this resolution
is possible either can be seen
intuitively as you maintain, or
requires proof as I maintain.
Which of us is right?

I was specially glad to have